

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 1 to 12, all other claims having been cancelled. Claims 13 to 21 are drawn to non-elected subject matter but applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application directed thereto. The Examining Attorney has required a nine-way restriction requirement between claims 1 to 10, drawn to a process, claims 11 and 12, drawn to an apparatus, claims 13 to 15, drawn to a product, claim 16, drawn to a drupe pulp paste, claim 17, drawn to volatile aromatic compounds recovered from drupes, claim 18, drawn to the use of drupe oil, claim 19, drawn to the use of drupe pulp paste, claim 20, drawn to the use of woody shells of the stones and claim 21, drawn to the use of the kernel press cake.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the nine-way restriction requirement. Applicant has cancelled Groups III to IX with the right to file a divisional application directed thereto; however, it is requested that claims 1 to 10, drawn to the process for the processing of fruits and claims 11 and 12, drawn to an apparatus, be examined together as it is believed that there is a single invention involved. The apparatus, as defined by features a) to d), at least and advantageously with features e) and f) in claim 11, define common inventive features with the process features as defined by

steps a) to d) and preferably e) of claim 1 and, therefore, it is believed that there is a common inventive concept between the process claim 1 and the apparatus of claim 11 and that, therefore, there is a single invention under U.S. patent law practice so as to be examined in the same application without an undue burden upon the Examiner.

Moreover, the apparatus is specific for the treatment of oil drupes and cannot yield oil from seeds because the moisture content in seeds is too low to provide for the bursting out when the hot material comes to be subjected to a vacuum and, therefore, it is believed that there is a single inventive concept involved in the application so as to be examined without an undue burden upon the Examiner.

Since the first Office Action was merely a restriction requirement, Applicant asks for a prompt examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,  
Muserlian, Lucas and Mercanti

  
Charles A. Muserlian, 19,683  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Tel. # (212) 661-8000

CAM:sd  
Enclosure: Return Receipt Postcard